Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, ??–?? (0000) Printed 25 February 2014 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

A neutrino model fit to the CMB power spectrum

T. Shanks[1⋆], R.W.F. Johnson[1], J.A. Schewtschenko[1], J.R. Whitbourn[1]
[1] *Physics Department, Durham University, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK*

arXiv:1402.5502v1 [astro-ph.CO] 22 Feb 2014

25 February 2014

ABSTRACT

The current standard cosmological model, ΛCDM, provides an excellent fit to the WMAP and Planck CMB data. However the model has well known problems. For example, the cosmological constant, Λ, is fine tuned to 1 part in 10^{100} and the cold dark matter (CDM) particle is not yet detected in the laboratory. Here we seek an alternative model to ΛCDM which makes minimal assumptions about new physics. This is based on previous work by Shanks who investigated a model which assumed neither exotic particles nor a cosmological constant but instead postulated a low Hubble constant (H_0) to help allow a baryon density which was compatible with an inflationary model with zero spatial curvature ie $k = 0$. However, the recent Planck results make it more difficult to reconcile such a model with the cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature fluctuations. Here we relax the previous assumptions to assess the effects of assuming standard model neutrinos of moderate mass ($\approx 5eV$) but with no CDM and no cosmological constant. If we assume a low $H_0 \approx 45 \mathrm{kms}^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$ then we now find a reasonable fit to the Planck CMB power spectrum. This model is related to the 11eV sterile neutrino model of Angus (2009) except there a cosmological constant was assumed with $H_0 \approx 70 \mathrm{kms}^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$. The problem for both these models is that the amplitude of fluctuations is low ($\sigma_8 \approx 0.2$) making it difficult to form galaxies by the present day. Angus advocated a modified gravity model to increase the growth rate of perturbations. Another approach is to invoke seeds for galaxy formation that might have existed just after decoupling. One possibility is cosmic string wakes but we believe seeds from a primordial magnetic field are more in the spirit of our 'what you see is what you get' model.

Key words: cosmology: observations, large-scale structure.

1 INTRODUCTION

The ΛCDM model is highly successful at fitting the phenomenology of observational cosmology including the CMB and large-scale matter power spectra and these are highly important successes. However, the model suffers from problems at a more fundamental level. First the size of the cosmological constant Λ implies a variety of fine tuning (Carroll 2001). For example, in the early Universe at the end of the inflationary epoch, the ratio of the vacuum energy implied by Λ to the energy in the radiation is 1 part in $\approx 10^{100}$. The vacuum energy of the cosmological constant can be replaced with dark energy whose density can evolve with time and thus alleviate this fine tuning. However, there still remains the coincidence of why the matter and dark energy densities reach equality so close to the present day. The dark matter component of the model also has the problem that the favoured candidate, the neutralino, is as yet undetected in the laboratory. The lower limits on supersymmetric particle masses such as the s-quark have reached $> 1TeV$ at the LHC and almost rule out the Minimal Supersymmetric Model (MSSM) (eg Buchmueller et al. (2013)). New limits from direct detection dark matter experiments such as LUX have ruled out a large part of the WIMP mass plus WIMP-nucleon cross-section plane of interest to MSSM (LUX Collaboration et al. 2013). Previous claims of WIMP direct detections at $\approx 10GeV$ masses have been comprehensively ruled out by the LUX data. Finally, the idea that new supersymmetric particles may exist at masses of a few hundred GeV is difficult to reconcile with the absence of an electron electric dipole moment at present experimental limits (Hudson et al. 2011; ACME Collaboration et al. 2013).

The ΛCDM model also has well-known astrophysical problems. In particular, the halo mass function increases like a power-law towards small scales and looks little like the luminosity or stellar mass functions of galaxies which exhibit

⋆ E-mail: tom.shanks@durham.ac.uk

© 0000 RAS

a characteristic knee in their distribution at around Milky Way size. This has to be addressed by feed-back from supernovae and/or AGN which keeps the smallest haloes dark (Benson et al. 2003; Baugh et al. 2005; Bower et al. 2006). Star-formation feedback is also used to suppress the visibility of sub-haloes in the Milky Way which would otherwise overpredict the number of satellite galaxies by more than an order of magnitude. However, these feedback mechanisms may have issues. It has been argued that some of the Milky Way sub-haloes are 'too big to fail' and so cannot be simply erased by feedback (Boylan-Kolchin, Bullock, & Kaplinghat 2011). It has also been argued that although a feedback prescription can reproduce the luminosity function of Milky Way satellites their M/L and/or their density concentrations may still be incorrect eg Zavala et al. (2009). Also the known MW and Andromeda satellites may be found in a planar configuration, difficult to reproduce in a merging model like ΛCDM (Ibata et al. 2013). There have been other claims that dwarf galaxies have cores rather than the cusps predicted by ΛCDM (Moore 1994). Essentially these are all symptoms of the fact that the top-down structure formation of ΛCDM model produces too much power at small scales. However, there are other issues including the lack of merging evident in the evolution of the stellar mass function of even the reddest galaxies.

These problems have led several authors to look at other models such as Warm Dark Matter (WDM) or Modified Gravity. For example, Lovell et al. (2012) have investigated the possibilities of a 1keV sterile neutrino. McGaugh (2004) also suggested that a model with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.97$, $\Omega_b = 0.02$ and $\Omega_\nu = 0.01$ could fit the early WMAP data. Angus (2009) have suggested that a model with three massless active neutrinos and one 11eV sterile neutrino and a cosmological constant gives a good fit to the CMB power spectrum. Here, also motivated by the issues for ΛCDM, we further consider the pros and cons of Hot Dark Matter (HDM) models. We start with the low-H_0 baryonic model of Shanks et al as an example of the 'what you see is what you get' approach in terms of the efforts that have been made to reconcile it to the WMAP and Planck CMB data.

Thus in Section 2 we therefore describe the low H_0 baryon dominated model of Shanks (1985). In Section 3 we discuss how a cosmological model that assumes a 5eV mass for each active neutrino species produces a much improved fit to the CMB power spectrum. In Section 4 we shall simulate neutrino universes using GADGET2 to assess the usual issues for galaxy formation in neutrino models. In Section 5 we shall discuss whether primordial magnetic fields might be able to seed galaxy formation in the neutrino model and in Section 6 we present our conclusions.

2 LOW H_0, BARYON DOMINATED MODEL

Shanks (1985) argued that an Einstein-de Sitter model with a low H_0 would address several problems with a baryon-only model. First it would allow an $\Omega_b = 1$ model that was compatible with an inflationary $k = 0$ model and with the nucleosynthesis of light element abundances. This is because nucleosynthesis constrains the quantity $\Omega_b h^2$ rather than simply Ω_b. At the time, nucleosynthesis suggested $\Omega_b h^2 < 0.06$ and this meant that if $h < 0.3$ then $\Omega_b \approx 1$ started to be allowed. Secondly, the lower H_0 went the more the hot X-ray gas fills up rich clusters of galaxies like the Coma cluster. The ratio of virial to X-ray gas mass goes as $\approx 15h^{1.5}$ so for $h \approx 0.25$ the virial to X-ray mass ratio reduces to a factor of ≈ 2. Finally, any Einstein-de Sitter model requires a low Hubble constant so that the age of the Universe remains older than the age of the stars. So at the price of adopting a low H_0, a model with neither dark energy nor exotic particle dark matter would be needed. Of course, distance scale measurements have moved down from $500\mathrm{kms}^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$ to $70\mathrm{kms}^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$ since Hubble's first measurement.

Unfortunately, the low H_0, $\Omega_b = 1$ model gives a first acoustic peak in the CMB at $l = 330$ rather than $l = 220$. There have been two attempts to move the first peak by smoothing it. Shanks (2007) investigated whether lensing by foreground galaxy groups and clusters might smooth the peak enough to make the smaller scale, high amplitude peaks in the baryonic model fit the larger scale, lower amplitude peaks seen in the CMB data. He found that in principle the peak could be moved but the problem was that the amplitude of foreground clustering had to be 10× larger than expected from virial analysis of groups and clusters. Sawangwit & Shanks (2010) (see also Whitbourn, Shanks, & Sawangwit (2014)) then pointed out that the WMAP beam also could have a significant smoothing effect on the CMB peaks. A check on radio sources suggested that the WMAP beam could be wider than expected from observations of the planets. Unfortunately, radio sources have too low signal to check the beam profile out to the 1-2 deg. scales which are vital for the position of the first peak. Also before the Planck results it was possible to change the first peak position without doing much damage to the other peaks. Since they were being measured by other ground-based experiments it was possible to change the first peak in WMAP while maintaining the form of the Silk-damping tail from these other experiments. But Planck measures all the peaks simultaneously so it is not possible to move the first peak without smoothing the others away. These problems make it difficult to see how the $\Omega_b = 1$ model can fit the Planck CMB data.

The model also has issues with galaxy formation in that Silk damping of the small-scale perturbations means that galaxies take a long time to form. At $z = 0$ the predicted rms mass fluctuation on $8\mathrm{h}^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}$ scales is $\sigma_8 \approx 0.2$ rather than the $\sigma_8 \approx 1$ seen in the galaxy distribution. Although there are also advantages for a top-down model for galaxy formation it seems that these are outweighed by the difficulties with the CMB and matter power spectra in the baryon dominated model. To escape the difficulties with ΛCDM and the $\Omega_b = 1$ models we are therefore motivated to look for other alternatives.

3 NEUTRINO MODEL FIT TO THE CMB

We therefore used CAMB (Lewis, Challinor, & Lasenby 2000) to investigate a model similar to the baryon dominated model in that it only uses standard model particles but it assumes a non-zero mass for neutrinos as suggested by various solar neutrino experiments. We searched for combinations of parameters including massive active neutrinos that fitted the Planck CMB results. If we take $\Omega_b = 0.15$ and

$\Omega_\nu = 0.85$ then with $H_0 = 45\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ this corresponds to the three active neutrinos each having a mass of 5eV. This mass is not far from the 2σ upper limit of 2.2eV found from tritium β decay experiments (Aseev et al. 2011) and within the $m_{\nu e} < 5.8$eV 2σ upper limit derived from the neutrinos detected from SN1987A (Pagliaroli, Rossi-Torres, & Vissani 2010). If the β decay upper limit is confirmed then the neutrinos would have to be interpreted as sterile rather than active. This model is compared to the Planck CMB temperature power spectrum(Planck collaboration et al. 2013) in Fig. 1 where we have kept the optical depth implied by polarisation results to $\tau = 0.09$ as in the ΛCDM case. We have similarly assumed $n = 0.96$ for the primordial power spectrum index. For the first three peaks at least, this model is nearly as good a fit as that for ΛCDM, although the fourth and fifth peaks are generally overestimated by the model. We found that increasing H_0 to $70\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ (and hence increasing the mass of each neutrino to $\approx 13eV$) immediately reduces the height of the second peak and hence also the quality of the fit. Decreasing Ω_ν and increasing Ω_b, although advantageous in moving the neutrino mass smaller, moves the first peak away from $l = 220$ and closer to the $\Omega_b = 1$ value of $l = 330$. Increasing Ω_ν makes the neutrino mass larger and moves the first peak to $l < 220$ while reducing the height of the first peak.

This model may be related to that of Angus (2009) where a CMB fit was obtained assuming an 11eV sterile neutrino, a cosmological constant and $H_0 = 70\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$. The acceleration in the expansion produced by the cosmological constant reduces the Hubble parameter from $H_0 \approx 70$ to $H_0 \approx 40\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ at $z = 1000$. At the expense of introducing the cosmological constant the fit to the fourth and fifth CMB peaks is improved. We also investigated the possibility of introducing the cosmological constant and $H_0 \approx 70\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ into our model with 3 active massive neutrinos but this provided fits which were slightly less acceptable with the first peak appearing at $l \approx 250$ rather than $l \approx 220$.

Note that the lack of ISW effect in the Einstein-de Sitter neutrino model means that it fits the $l < 50$ part of the Planck spectrum better than either the ΛCDM or the Angus neutrino model. The chi-square for our 5eV neutrino model is certainly higher than for ΛCDM mostly due to the poor fit of the fourth and fifth peaks but this model is at least more within range of the possible CMB systematics such as lensing and beam profile effects discussed by Shanks (2007), Sawangwit & Shanks (2010) and Whitbourn, Shanks, & Sawangwit (2014). But we leave investigation of how these systematics could improve specifically our active neutrino model fit to a future paper.

The main problem for both neutrino models is that the predicted matter power spectrum at $z = 0$ lies a factor of 5 - 6 below the ΛCDM power-spectrum (see Fig. 2). Indeed the neutrino model amplitude is little different from the form and amplitude of the $\Omega_b = 1$ model, due to the similar effects of neutrino free-streaming and Silk damping. From linear theory the predicted rms mass fluctuation on $8\text{h}^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ scales is $\sigma_8 \approx 0.2$ again close to the baryon model prediction. This means that the neutrino-dominated model will have the same problem as the baryon-dominated model in that galaxy formation will be too slow. This is the traditional problem for the neutrino model but the excellent fit to the CMB data now means it may be worth looking more seriously for ways around this issue.



Figure 1. The red solid line shows the neutrino dominated model with $\Omega_\nu = 0.85$, $\Omega_b = 0.15$, $h = 0.45$ and $n = 0.96$. The blue dashed line shows the neutrino dominated model of Angus (2009) with $\Omega_\nu = 0.23$, $\Omega_b = 0.05$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.72$ and $H_0 = 71.5\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$. Both models are compared to the Planck CMB angular power spectrum.



Figure 2. The solid red line shows the matter power spectrum, $P(k)$, predicted by the ΛCDM model. The blue dashed line shows $P(k)$ for the $\Omega_b = 1$, $H_0 = 35\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ model and the green solid line shows the $P(k)$ for our 5eV neutrino model with $\Omega_\nu = 0.85$, $\Omega_b = 0.15$ and $H_0 = 35\text{kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$. All 3 models assume similar CMB normalisations at large scales.

4 NEUTRINO + BARYON SIMULATIONS

We used GADGET-2 to run neutrino model hydrodynamical simulations. Because of the difficulties in setting up free-streaming initial conditions, we simply ran the simulations starting with the linear theory power spectrum at $z = 7$ and running with zero free-streaming. The box size was $150h^{-1}$Mpc on a side with 2×256^3 particles representing neutrinos and gas.

The initial hope here was to build on the work of Bode, Ostriker, & Turok (2001), Wang & White (2007) and Lovell et al. (2012) who investigated the appearance of spurious haloes in filaments produced in WDM and HDM simulations. These haloes were certainly spurious in that their number depended on the simulation resolution and their origin was traced to discreteness in the grid initial conditions. However, Wang & White (2007) concluded that the growth rate in the filaments must be fast once the filaments form and therefore there is the possibility that if there are any seed fluctuations they might also benefit from this fast filamentary growth rate. One possibility is that if stars can be formed from the gas component then these might form suitable seeds. Otherwise more exotic seeds might have to be considered such as cosmic string wakes (but see Abel et al. (1998); also Duplessis & Brandenberger (2013).

The problem is that with 5 eV neutrinos, the free-streaming scale is around $\approx 50h^{-1}$Mpc at $z \approx 1000$ and this scale is barely non-linear by the present day at least as judged by the galaxy clustering power spectrum. In Fig. 3 we see that a CMB-normalised simulation that produces $\sigma_8 = 0.2$ in the neutrinos at the present day shows little difference in form and amplitude with the linear theory prediction. Therefore the first difficulty is that non-linear neutrino filaments form very late and in this case gas dynamics and cooling provide little further help in forming galaxies.

We then ran models with enhanced initial amplitudes to give $\sigma_8 = 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$ in the neutrinos by the present day. These simulated power spectra are also shown in Fig. 3. It can be see that for the $\sigma_8 = 0.6, 0.8$ models, the $z = 0$ power spectrum slope changes to match better the ΛCDM power spectrum, also shown. We note that in these high amplitude neutrino models, larger halo masses or clusters form earlier and this is more in line with observational data. But the problem remains that the amplitude of rms fluctuations to produce these results is a factor of $\approx 3\times$ larger than implied by the amplitude of perturbations given by the CMB combined with linear theory growth rates. For galaxies to form the extra amplitude must either come from faster growth rates via modified gravity as discussed by Skordis et al. (2006); Angus (2009) or by introducing 'seeds' as we discuss further below.



Figure 3. Simulated matter power spectra (and errors) calculated using POWMES(Colombi et al. 2009) from 3×5eV neutrino simulations made using GADGET-2, starting at $z = 7$. Filled blue circles show a model with initial conditions that produce $\sigma_8 = 0.2$ in the neutrinos by the present day as predicted by linear theory for models normalised to the CMB power spectrum. Green crosses, red triangles and green stars show the effect of increasing the amplitude of the initial power spectrum to give $\sigma_8 = 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$. The blue line shows the standard ΛCDM power spectrum. The results suggest that this neutrino model needs $3\times$ the level of rms perturbations ($\sigma_8 = 0.6$) allowed by the CMB to match the ΛCDM fit to the data at the present day.

5 DISCUSSION

A cosmological model with three $\approx$ 5eV classical neutrinos gives CMB power spectrum results which are close to those observed by experiments such as Planck. The first issue is that the model has to assume a low value of Hubble's constant, ($H_0 \approx 45$kms^{-1}Mpc^{-1}), and higher values near the HST Key Project value of $H_0 = 72 \pm 8$kms^{-1}Mpc^{-1} (Freedman et al. 2001) give much poorer fits. There is also the issue that any Einstein-de Sitter model will be in disagreement with the SNIa Hubble diagram which implies an accelerating expansion of the Universe (Schmidt et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999; Riess et al. 2001). Both of these issues can be partly addressed if there exists a local underdensity (Keenan, Barger, & Cowie 2013; Whitbourn & Shanks 2014). However, this is only able to explain 10% of the $\approx$50% disagreement in H_0. The other part of the discrepancy would have to be be explained by issues with the Cepheid and SNIa standard candles, for example, as discussed by Allen & Shanks (2004). Of course, the positive side is that eliminating the accelerating Universe eliminates the fine-tuning problems associated with the cosmological constant or dark energy. Also the percentage of baryons in the neutrino model is 15% whereas the fraction of baryons in Coma is $\approx$ 20% with $H_0 = 45$kms^{-1}Mpc^{-1} so there is no 'baryon catastrophe' here like there was in the standard CDM model where the universal baryon fraction was $\approx$ 10% and the exotic particle fraction was $\approx$ 30% (White et al. 1993).

The main problem is that even with the help of the baryons, it is difficult to form galaxies. The free-streaming scale of $\approx 50h^{-1}$Mpc means that superclusters have to be the first structures to condense out of the expansion with galaxies forming in their top-down collapse. Even without free-streaming and the help of gas hydrodynamics we find that our simulations confirm that with models normalised to

the CMB, the rms neutrino fluctuations only reach $\sigma_8 = 0.2$ by $z = 0$. This problem remains unsolved.

We have shown that we need a factor of $\approx 3 - 4$ increase in the gravitational growth rate to form galaxies in this model. By artificially boosting the initial amplitude of perturbations by this factor, the simulations produce a present day matter power spectrum much closer to the the standard ΛCDM fit to the data. As already mentioned, in top-down structure formation the largest objects are produced first and again this is closer to the 'down-sizing' seen in the observations than what ΛCDM models, left to themselves, produce. In the high amplitude neutrino simulations that we ran, the halo mass function also appears closer to the broken power-law seen in galaxy luminosity and stellar mass functions than the power-law form produced by ΛCDM.

We considered modified gravity as an approach to increase the growth rate. Angus (2009) in their model with an 11 eV sterile neutrino uses the modified gravity model of Skordis et al. (2006) and claims a good fit to the matter power spectrum. But since we do not need to produce repulsive force at large scales because we do not need to invoke a cosmological constant, this route seems less attractive.

Alternative routes to galaxy formation in the neutrino model include seeding baryon fluctuations in cosmic string wakes. However, Abel et al. (1998), tested this idea using cosmic string in a neutrino model and found that these wakes make little difference to fluctuation growth rates.

More in the spirit of 'what you see is what you get' models we consider seeding by a primordial magnetic field (PMF). Peebles (1980) reviewed the possibilities in a pure baryonic model and following Wasserman (1978) concluded that to obtain $\delta\rho/\rho \approx 10^{-3}$ at decoupling ($z \approx 1000$) the required present intergalactic magnetic field is $\approx 10^{-9}$ Gauss. Given an interstellar magnetic field of $\approx 10^{-6}$Gauss might correspond to $\approx 10^{-10}$Gauss if isotropically expanded to present day IGM densities, then this is in reasonable agreement with what is predicted assuming no amplification by the galactic dynamo effect (Parker 1975) since decoupling. Although in our model with only 15% baryons the required PMF would need to be correspondingly larger, these order of magnitude arguments may still apply.

Galaxy formation from PMF seeds may look more like a monolithic collapse model than by the mergers that characterise the ΛCDM model. Kim, Olinto, & Rosner (1996) made predictions for the matter power spectrum that is produced by PMF. (Note that Shaw & Lewis (2010, 2012) have also made PMF predictions for the CMB and matter power spectra in the context of the ΛCDM model). Kim, Olinto, & Rosner (1996) found that in a pure baryonic model the predicted large scale matter power spectrum was $P(k) \propto k^4$. In this case the steepness of the matter power spectrum may cause the evolution of the galaxy luminosity and stellar mass functions may be more in line with the pure luminosity evolution/monolithic form frequently seen in the observations (Metcalfe et al. 2001, 2006). Clearly, PMF could also provide an alternative to modified gravity as a route to galaxy formation for the 11eV sterile neutrino model of Angus (2009).

Active neutrinos of mass ≈ 5eV are compatible with the Tremaine & Gunn (1979) phase-space density upper limit so that such particles can contribute significantly to the dark matter content of galaxy clusters. Angus et al. (2007) also note that neutrinos with a few eV mass are also consistent with the Bullet Cluster observations (Clowe et al. 2006).

However, we also note that the neutrino model would not produce the BAO feature at $z = 0.55$ detected by SDSS DR11 CMASS galaxies (Anderson et al. 2013). First, although the power spectrum does show acoustic oscillations, the peak scale in the correlation function at $z = 0$ would be at $\approx 120\mathrm{h}^{-1}$Mpc rather than $\approx 105\mathrm{h}^{-1}$Mpc. Furthermore, the low amplitude of the oscillations means that the peak would not be seen in the correlation function at all (see Johnson et al, 2014 in prep.). Thus for the neutrino model to evade this constraint, it would have to be argued that the DR11 CMASS BAO peak was subject to bigger systematic and/or random errors than claimed. Johnson et al are checking the level of rejection of the neutrino model using simple static simulations. If the CMASS errors prove reliable then the Angus (2009) neutrino model may also have problems because it also predicts no BAO peak in the galaxy correlation function.

Some of the advantages of the previous baryonic model carry through to the neutrino model. Thus although low mass neutrinos cannot constitute the dark matter in spiral galaxies due to the Tremaine & Gunn (1979) limit, their flat rotation curves might be explained by a $1/r$ surface density distribution in the disc (Mestel 1963), perhaps due to difficult to detect, cold gas. The lower baryon density together with the low H_0 are also now more compatible with light element nucleosynthesis. We already noted that the new value of H_0 means that the X-ray gas component is a less massive component of the Coma cluster than in the pure baryonic case and the presence of the neutrinos means that this is not an issue for the model.

6 CONCLUSIONS

We have found that a cosmological model with three ≈ 5eV classical neutrinos produce a good fit to the first three peaks of the microwave background power spectrum if a low value of $H_0 \approx 45\mathrm{kms}^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$ is assumed. The model overestimates the amplitude of the fourth and fifth peaks but this may be improved by smoothing due to lensing or beam profile systematics (Shanks 2007; Whitbourn, Shanks, & Sawangwit 2014).

The main problem with the model concerns the difficulty in forming galaxies due to the free-streaming of the neutrinos. The neutrino model provides a matter power spectrum with a turnover at $\approx 25\mathrm{h}^{-1}$Mpc caused by free-streaming which erases fluctuations on small scales. We have concluded that galaxy formation seeds are required for the initial conditions and we have suggested that primordial magnetic fields may provide such seeds. Such fields can produce a steep matter power spectrum useful for galaxy formation in hot dark matter models. The baryon power spectrum generated by primordial magnetic fields will dominate the power spectrum at small scales. We have noted that such a power spectrum may lead to models more like the monolithic collapse models that the galaxy evolution data favour rather than the merging dominated galaxy formation of ΛCDM.

There are various other problems with the neutrino model. The value of H_0 is low and would require help from a local hole underdensity and other systematic issues with

SNIa and Cepheid distances. The matter power spectrum for the model contains baryon acoustic oscillations but these are at too low an amplitude to be compatible with the acoustic peak seen in the DR11 CMASS galaxy correlation function. If the errors on the correlation function are reliable then this would also present a serious problem for any neutrino-dominated model.

There are various other issues that can either be regarded as problems or opportunities. The 5eV neutrino masses are compatible with SN1987A upper limits on the neutrino mass (Pagliaroli, Rossi-Torres, & Vissani 2010) but already above the 2.2eV 2σ upper limit from tritium β decay experiments (Aseev et al. 2011). Certainly experiments like KATRIN (KATRIN collaboration 2001) should be able to detect or reject this mass for the electron neutrino at high significance. PMF at the levels required for galaxy formation in our neutrino model will also be detectable by the Planck CMB polarisation results and other seed mechanisms would have to be sought if the required primordial magnetic fields are ruled out.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Ashley Ross (ICG, Portsmouth) for useful preliminary discussions on the CMASS DR11 correlation function error analysis. JRW acknowledges receipt of an STFC PhD studentship.

REFERENCES

Abel T., Stebbins A., Anninos P., Norman M. L., 1998, ApJ, 508, 530
ACME Collaboration, et al., 2013, arXiv, arXiv:1310.7534
Allen P. D., Shanks T., 2004, MNRAS, 347, 1011
Anderson L., et al., 2013, arXiv, arXiv:1312.4877
Angus G. W., Shan H. Y., Zhao H. S., Famaey B., 2007, ApJ, 654, L13
Angus G. W., 2009, MNRAS, 394, 527
Aseev V. N., et al., 2011, PhRvD, 84, 112003
Baugh C. M., Lacey C. G., Frenk C. S., Granato G. L., Silva L., Bressan A., Benson A. J., Cole S., 2005, MNRAS, 356, 1191
Benson A. J., Bower R. G., Frenk C. S., Lacey C. G., Baugh C. M., Cole S., 2003, ApJ, 599, 38
Bode P., Ostriker J. P., Turok N., 2001, ApJ, 556, 93
Boylan-Kolchin M., Bullock J. S., Kaplinghat M., 2011, MNRAS, 415, L40
Bower R. G., Benson A. J., Malbon R., Helly J. C., Frenk C. S., Baugh C. M., Cole S., Lacey C. G., 2006, MNRAS, 370, 645
Buchmueller O., et al., 2013, arXiv, arXiv:1312.5250
Carroll S. M., 2001, LRR, 4, 1
Clowe D., Bradač M., Gonzalez A. H., Markevitch M., Randall S. W., Jones C., Zaritsky D., 2006, ApJ, 648, L109
Colombi S., Jaffe A., Novikov D., Pichon C., 2009, MNRAS, 393, 511
Duplessis F., Brandenberger R., 2013, JCAP, 4, 45
Freedman W. L., et al., 2001, ApJ, 553, 47
Hudson, J.J., Kara, D.M., Smallman, I.J., Sauer, B.E. Tarbutt,, M.R. & Hinds, E.A. 1011, Nature, 473, 493
Ibata R. A., et al., 2013, Natur, 493, 62
KATRIN collaboration, 2001, hep.ex..., arXiv:hep-ex/0109033
Keenan R. C., Barger A. J., Cowie L. L., 2013, ApJ, 775, 62
Kim E.-J., Olinto A. V., Rosner R., 1996, ApJ, 468, 28
Lewis A., Challinor A., Lasenby A., 2000, ApJ, 538, 473
Lovell M. R., et al., 2012, MNRAS, 420, 2318
LUX Collaboration, et al., 2013, arXiv, arXiv:1310.8214
McGaugh S. S., 2004, ApJ, 611, 26
Mestel L., 1963, MNRAS, 126, 553
Metcalfe N., Shanks T., Campos A., McCracken H. J., Fong R., 2001, MNRAS, 323, 795
Metcalfe N., Shanks T., Weilbacher P. M., McCracken H. J., Fong R., Thompson D., 2006, MNRAS, 370, 1257
Moore B., 1994, Natur, 370, 629
Pagliaroli G., Rossi-Torres F., Vissani F., 2010, APh, 33, 287
Parker E. N., 1975, ApJ, 198, 205
Peebles P. J. E., 1980, lssu.book,
Percival W. J., et al., 2013, arXiv, arXiv:1312.4841
Perlmutter S., et al., 1999, ApJ, 517, 565
Planck collaboration, et al., 2013, arXiv, arXiv:1303.5075
Riess A. G., et al., 2001, ApJ, 560, 49
Ross A. J., et al., 2012, MNRAS, 424, 564
Sawangwit U., Shanks T., 2010, MNRAS, 407, L16
Schmidt B. P., et al., 1998, ApJ, 507, 46
Shanks T., 1985, Vistas in Astronomy, 28, 595
Shanks T., 2007, MNRAS, 376, 173
Shaw J. R., Lewis A., 2010, PhRvD, 81, 043517
Shaw J. R., Lewis A., 2012, PhRvD, 86, 043510
Skordis C., Mota D. F., Ferreira P. G., Bœhm C., 2006, PhRvL, 96, 011301
Tremaine S., Gunn J. E., 1979, PhRvL, 42, 407
Wang J., White S. D. M., 2007, MNRAS, 380, 93
Wasserman I., 1978, ApJ, 224, 337
Whitbourn J. R., Shanks T., Sawangwit U., 2014, MNRAS, 437, 622
Whitbourn J. R., Shanks T., 2014, MNRAS, 437, 2146
White S. D. M., Navarro J. F., Evrard A. E., Frenk C. S., 1993, Natur, 366, 429
Zavala J., Jing Y. P., Faltenbacher A., Yepes G., Hoffman Y., Gottlöber S., Catinella B., 2009, ApJ, 700, 1779